

commend my colleague from California, Mr. GALLEGLY, for his efforts.

This is a fitting way to honor Bob Lagomarsino. During his nine terms in the House, Bob worked tirelessly for the preservation of California's natural resources. Perhaps the centerpiece of this mission was his successful effort to establish the Channel Islands National Park in 1980. Bob Lagomarsino is a Republican in the finest tradition of Teddy Roosevelt, recognizing the importance of preserving our environment and working to include unique areas in the National Park System. Bob had a major influence on landmark environmental legislation including the Alaska Wilderness Act, the Strip Mine Control Act, and the Land and Water Conservation Act.

On a personal level, I miss Bob's presence in the House. He was a thoughtful, productive, and diligent representative for the people of his district and the State of California. Bob Lagomarsino was one of those nuts-and-bolts legislators who would take up the less publicized but still important causes. His efforts on working to improve the status of the territories, for example, got him little attention in the media or from his constituents. But, typically for Bob, he devoted countless hours to this issue. He worked in a bipartisan manner, never compromising his principles, but never grandstanding either.

We also remember Bob Lagomarsino's years of dedicated service in the foreign policy arena. Bob took a passionate interest in fighting the spread of communism and played a key role in making the Reagan doctrine a reality. His efforts in Central America, for example, put America on the side of freedom. At a time when it wasn't fashionable to talk about spreading democracy and liberty around the world, Bob Lagomarsino never shrunk from his belief in this country and what it represents.

Bob Lagomarsino's efforts to protect the Channel Islands before his service in the House of Representatives. While serving in the California Senate, Bob Lagomarsino introduced and passed legislation to make the Channel Islands off limits to oil drilling. When he arrived in Washington in 1974, he introduced legislation to establish the Channel Islands National Park. After years of effort, Congress passed Bob Lagomarsino's bill in 1980.

Even after the establishment of the national park, Bob's commitment to protecting the Channel Islands and the fragile California coast continued. He worked for a number of years to secure funding for the park. He expended great effort to convince major oil companies to end shipments of oil through the channel. He worked with the International Maritime Organization to have the Channel Islands designated as an "area to be avoided" by international shippers. He persuaded President Bush to withdraw leases for offshore oil in the channel. He authored an amendment to bring offshore oil operations under State and Federal clean air standards.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has benefited greatly from the public service of Bob Lagomarsino. It is most appropriate that we honor that service with this resolution. Were it not for Bob's persistence and dedication, there would be no Channel Islands National Park. I think it is fitting and proper that Americans visiting this treasured part of California appreciate something of the man who made this park possible.

Again, I salute ELTON GALLEGLY for his work over the last few years on this legislation. I urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation of objection, and urge passage of the joint resolution.

□ 1810

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 50

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The visitors center at the Channel Islands National Park, California, is designated as the "Robert J. Lagomarsino Visitors Center".

#### SEC. 2. LEGAL REFERENCES.

Any reference in any law, regulation, document, record, map, or other paper of the United States to the visitors center referred to in section 1 is deemed to be a reference to the "Robert J. Lagomarsino Visitors Center".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert:

#### SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The visitor center at the Channel Islands National Park, California, is designated as the "Robert J. Lagomarsino Visitor Center".

#### SEC. 2. LEGAL REFERENCES.

Any reference in any law, regulation, document, record, map, or other paper of the United States to the visitor center referred to in section 1 is deemed to be a reference to the "Robert J. Lagomarsino Visitor Center".

Mr. GALLEGLY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the joint resolution was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to designate the visitor center at the Channel Islands National Park, California, as the "Robert J. Lagomarsino Visitor Center."."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### THINK HARD ABOUT MFN FOR CHINA

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today's New York Times points out that the State Department released its 1995 report on human rights, and human rights has fallen behind in China.

We ought to be careful when we consider MFN later on this year, because there is slave labor in China making goods. In fact, I will bet there are members of Congress that are wearing clothing made by slave labor in China.

There is organ sales; for \$30,000 you can get a slave labor person shot, and they will donate their kidney for you.

There is persecution of Christians whereby they are going in house churches. It goes on and on.

Lastly, members concerned about the economy, the trade imbalance with China is now \$30 billion. When Tiananmen Square came, it was \$6 billion, and now it is \$30 billion.

I strongly urge every Member to get today's New York Times and read it, especially before we vote on MFN, because we should never give MFN to a nation that is persecuting its own people and destroying the Christian Church and plundering Tibet.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the State Department released its 1995 Report on Human Rights which said what human rights observers have been saying for the past 7 months, that the human rights situation in China has deteriorated since President Clinton renewed China's most-favored-nation status last May.

The report, as quoted in today's New York Times says,

In 1994, there continued to be widespread and well-documented human rights abuses in China, in violation of internationally accepted norms, stemming both from the authorities' intolerance of dissent and the inadequacy of legal safeguards for freedom of speech, association and religion.

Even Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs Winston Lord was forced to admit the same thing several weeks ago in light of all the harsh realities.

The Times article summarizes the report as follows:

The report criticizes the Chinese Government for detention of perhaps thousands of "prisoners of conscience;" an inadequate accounting of those who are missing or detained after the 1989 pro-democracy demonstrations; and crackdown of journalists; the routine arrest of dissidents during foreign visits and requiring prisoners to work in labor camps.

The report notes that forced abortion and sterilization occurs, and accuses the Chinese Government of forcing prisoners to donate their organs for transplants. It also acknowledges the horrendous repression of dissent occurring in Tibet the tiny Himalayan country occupied by the Chinese for over three decades.

That is not all that has deteriorated. In 1989, the year of the Tiananmen Square tragedy, the United States trade deficit with China was \$6 billion; now the trade deficit has exploded

to \$30 billion. That's a 500-percent increase. And what is worse is that American workers are forced to compete with products manufactured with slave labor.

On all fronts, our engagement policy with China is not working. It is not improving human rights and it is not improving the trade deficit. This year I hope the Congress will think long and hard about changing it.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1994, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI] was recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BARR addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MENENDEZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### NUTRITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities held a hearing on the Contract With America, which deals with our nutrition programs. And a representative of the American School Food Service Association testified that if the Personal Responsibility Act were enacted as currently written, 40,000 out of the 93,000 school districts in the United States would stop serving school meals. That is breakfast and lunches for early—for children who get to school earlier. This, as we recall, was a bill that passed in 1946, in recognizing that children needed to have a lunch program and a breakfast program to make them ready for school.

During World War II we found a lot of our children were not up to the nutrition standards that we needed. So that is why 1946, this program started. The reasoning behind the dramatic elimi-

nation of those school meals programs is cost. And yet we are literally cutting off our nose to spite our face.

During this hearing today, "the local perspective," five of the six witnesses presented were community nutrition providers. A recent study by the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimated that this bill, if we pass it, would cost the state of Texas \$15.1 billion in 1996 alone, representing a 30-percent cut in funding. Of all the States in the Nation, the State of Texas would be the one that would be cut the most. And the reason is, and I have an objective summary of that report that shows that that 1.1 billion would be cut because the State of Texas utilizes more food stamps than most other States. And yet in California, that would benefit to the tune of about \$600 million under this proposal, \$650 million to be exact, would benefit because they have a higher payment. They actually have less food stamp participation and yet they pay \$593 per month on the average in food stamp households in AFDC, whereas in the State of Texas we only pay \$174. So we are actually hurting the poorest of the poor by taking away that billion dollars from the poor in the State of Texas.

The formula punishes those States which depend on food stamps the most.

This not only covers nutrition sites in our schools, the breakfast program, and the lunch program. But it covers the senior program Meals on Wheels. In Harris County, we received \$1.5 million in 1994. This roughly represented over a million hot meals for seniors. If we pass this bill, the cuts by the Personal Responsibility Act would mean 300,000 a year or 800 meals a day in Harris County alone would not be served.

Lowering the number of Meals on Wheels could add to the health cost of these seniors. By taking away the meals from the seniors, we would push them to more likely seek assistance in elderly care centers and thereby possibly even raising our hospital costs so more seniors would be taking advantage of Medicare.

These senior citizen centers provide more than just a hot meal at lunch. They provide also companionship. I have as many as 35 in my own district that I visit, when we can get home on Fridays and Mondays, although this first hundred days we have not had much opportunity to do that, but staff who visit these centers make sure. In our district office we offer Social Security assistance and Medicare assistance and other assistance. But those seniors who go to those centers oftentimes have no one at home and that is the only hot meal that day.

Yet if we pass this proposal in the Contract With America or Contract on American, then we are going to cut these senior citizens from these hot meals, not just in Harris County or the State of Texas but throughout the country.

Another proposal that would be cut would be the Women, Infants and Chil-

dren. Again using my frame of reference, in Houston and Harris County, the city of Houston is the one that actually funds it or provides it with the funding from the Federal Government. This amount of funding would represent in Harris County, Texas \$13 million cut to the local grocers in Houston who benefit from the Women, Infants and Children Program.

The WIC Program, as we call it, is not an entitlement program. The program participants not only have financial needs but also nutritional needs. This helps with early childhood development. Those children, before they become eligible for public school, we can make sure of the nutrition that they need in their early years until they do get to public school.

Health costs could increase for these children from Medicaid and also provide it for our hospital districts, for example, our public hospital systems.

In a 1969 White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health, President Nixon said of the Federal responsibility for nutrition programs, "a child ill-fed is dull in curiosity, lower in stamina and distracted from learning."

We do not need to make these cuts in our programs.

□ 1820

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MARTINI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. NADLER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]